UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

_				- ~-		~	\sim			
1	1 N	. 1 1 7	ויו	7 C"	י איו	יאנויו	/ NI ?	A N.	41:15	ICA.
	יוו	.		, ,	1 A	ı		A IV	тнк.	11 4
٠,	. , ,	1 I	1 1 /1	<i>,</i> , ,		1111	\ / I	/ \ I I V	11/1	1 \ // \ .

Plaintiff,	
	Case No. 12-20298
v.	
D-1 DONALD CLIFTON ALLEN, JR.,	Hon. John Corbett O'Meara
Defendant.	
/	

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

Before the court is Defendant's motion for reconsideration of this court's September 4, 2014 order denying his motion to suppress. The standard for granting a motion for reconsideration is as follows:

Generally, and without restricting the court's discretion, the court will not grant motions for rehearing or reconsideration which merely present the same issues ruled upon by the court, either expressly or by reasonable implication. The movant shall not only demonstrate a palpable defect by which the court and the parties have been misled but also show that correcting the defect will result in a different disposition of the case.

LR 7.1(h)(3).

In denying Defendant's motion to suppress, the court found that Defendant did not have a legitimate expectation of privacy in the bedroom where he stayed at

5:12-cr-20298-JCO-MAR Doc # 63 Filed 10/01/14 Pg 2 of 2 Pg ID 250

Yun Hindy's home. Defendant suggests that the court based its decision on the

fact that Hindy "evicted" him and that he was no longer legitimately on the

premises. Defendant argues that, because Hindy did not formally begin eviction

procedures under Michigan law, he was legitimately on the premises at the time of

the search. The primary basis for the court's decision, however, was that

Defendant did not take normal precautions to maintain his privacy. See Opinion &

Order at 5. Even if Defendant could be said to be legitimately on the premises, his

actions in allowing third parties to be present (along with Nelson, whom he had

known for a short period of time) while he was away is completely inconsistent

with an expectation of privacy.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendant's motion for

reconsideration is DENIED.

s/John Corbett O'Meara

United States District Judge

Date: October 1, 2014

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon

counsel of record on this date, October 1, 2014, using the ECF system.

s/William Barkholz

Case Manager

-2-